



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/374,344

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	22

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marianne L. Padgett (3) AKIO KONNO  
(2) CALVIN GRIFFITH (4) MASAKAZU KOGO

Date of interview 4/22/03

YUKIO TAKANO  
TAKASHI HIGO

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: 2 videos, discussing product and  
commercial use, and a physical demonstration of coated and non-coated tile  
oil then rinsed with H<sub>2</sub>O - coated rinsed off easily, uncoated did not; showed links of companies  
Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached. licensing the technology as evidence  
of commercial success.

Claims discussed: claims of record, generally

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record, particularly Okaniwa et al, Field et al,  
Murasawa et al and Heller et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed how the mechanism  
produced by the coating of Okaniwa et al and present invention's are different due to different  
microstructure of the TiO<sub>2</sub>. In Field et al, the process differences were discussed as  
giving a different expectation of properties of the coating. Data in specification was pointed out.  
Heller et al and Murasawa et al were discussed, noting that while photocatalyst  
degree produced would not have been expected to be as claimed due to process differences, etc.  
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

☐ Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.

Marianne L. Padgett  
Examiner's Signature